IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE AT COLUMBIA

JOHN DOE)	
)	
v.) Case No. 1:23-cv-0	0002
) Campbell/Holmes	
BRIAN SPENCER)	

ORDER

On January 29, 2025, the *pro se* Defendant in this case made two filings. (Docket Entry Nos. 80 and 81.) The filings appear identical in all respects, and the purpose of making two identical filings is unclear. Nonetheless, Defendant requests that the undersigned reconsider the monetary sanctions that were imposed against him in the Memorandum Order entered January 16, 2025. (Docket Entry No. 79.) Accordingly, the Court shall construe the filings to be a motion for reconsideration of the Memorandum Order.

Defendant's request for reconsideration of the Memorandum Order and the sanctions imposed against him, as set forth in his filings of January 29, 2025 (Docket Entry Nos. 80 and 81), is **DENIED**. The reasoning and the basis for the Court's decision is clearly set out in the lengthy Memorandum Order, and nothing argued by Defendant in his request for reconsideration warrants any change or revision by the Court in its Memorandum Order. The Court's assessment of sanctions against Defendant remains unchanged, **as does the February 18, 2025 deadline for Defendant to file an answer and the resulting consequences of failing to file an answer by that deadline**.

Any party objecting to this Order must do so by filing a motion for review no later than fourteen (14) days from the date this Order is served upon the party. The objections/motion for review must be accompanied by a brief or other pertinent documents to apprise the District Judge of

the basis for the objection. *See* Rule 72.01(a) of the Local Rules of Court. Responses to the objections/motion for review must be filed within fourteen (14) days of service of the objections/motion for review. *See* Rule 72.01(b) of the Local Rules of Court.

It is **SO ORDERED**.

ARBARA D. HOLMES

United States Magistrate Judge